DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 881 EA 026 591

AUTHOR Hausman, Delbert C.; Boyd, William L.
TITLE School Administration in the Federal Republic of Germany and Its Implications for the United States.
PUB DATE Oct 94
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Philadelphia, PA, October 28-30, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Qualifications; *Administrator Role; Administrator Selection; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Governance; National Curriculum; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Qualifications; Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Germany (Bavaria)

ABSTRACT

This paper presents findings of a study that explored the governance and administration of elementary and secondary schools in Bavaria, in the Federal Republic of Germany. The sample included 12 Bavarian schools--3 each of the following 4 types of schools--elementary (Grundschulen) and secondary (Gymnasien, Realschulen, and Hauptschulen). Data were gathered from interviews with school principals or headmasters and some administrative staff, observation, and document analysis. Findings showed that the selection process for teachers in Germany is much more rigorous than in the United States. Principals are experienced classroom teachers with proven ability who continue to teach. In addition, the entire district apparatus is missing; there are no superintendents, lay boards of education, and so forth. Bavarian schools appear to function extremely well within a framework of fairly tight external control, while enjoying strong professionalism among educators and freedom from the micromanagement that all too often plagues their American counterparts. Findings underscore the need for fundamental and systemic reform in the United States; high student achievement must be preceded by advances in teacher professionalism. (Contains 35 references and 11 footnotes.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Hausman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 380 881

School Administration in the Federal Republic of Germany and Its Implications for the United States

Delbert C. Hausman

The Lower Moreland Township (PA) School District

(215) 938–0272

William L. Boyd

College of Education

The Pennsylvania State University

(814) 863–3760 or (814) 237–8936

Paper presented
at the Annual Convention of the
University Council for Educational Administration
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
October 28–30, 1994

EA 026 591

School Administration in the Federal Republic of Germany and Its Implications for the United States

Few dispute that public education in the United States is at a critical juncture.[1] Whether one accepts Shanker's (1983) assertion that the schools are facing a "crisis unprecedented in our history"—their "first real crisis" (p. 471), or shares Boyd's (1987) fear that failure of attempts to reform the schools might well signal the "last hurrah" (p. 85) of public education, there is general recognition that a major overhaul of American schools is long overdue. The reports of the so-called "second wave" of the current education reform movement agree that there is a great need for school restructuring, increased professionalism, and shared decisionmaking among educators (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; National Governors Association, 1986). Since American schools continue to be compared unfavorably with those of this country's major international competitors, it seems logical to examine these schools to see what can be learned from them.

To this end, this paper reports on the preliminary findings of an *exploratory* study of the governance and administration of elementary and secondary schools in one state in the Federal Republic of Germany. Since Germany has a highly regarded education system with relatively far fewer school administrators than in the United States—and no formal certification requirements or preparation programs exist for these administrators—data from Germany may shed considerable light on alternative structures for school governance and administration. Specifically, this study examines the structures and practices of administration in German elementary and secondary schools, primarily by means of interviews in a small sample of schools drawn in one large Bavarian city.

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1) What is the process of recruitment and socialization of school principals in Bavaria?

2) What does it mean to be an administrator in a German school? That is, what role, if any, do these individuals play in

    a) the decisionmaking process in general

    b) instructional leadership

    c) supervision of staff and/or programs

    d) evaluation of staff and/or programs

    e) budget and finance

    f) the disciplining of students

    g) public or community relations

3) How does day-to-day school administration function in Bavarian schools?

4) What are the functional equivalents that perform or substitute for the varied roles and responsibilities carried out by American school administrators, who apparently are far more numerous than their German counterparts? (For example, to what extent, and in what ways, do teachers take on or carry out administrative responsibilities, either individually or in committees?)

5) As exemplified in Bavaria, what appear to be the strengths and weaknesses of the German approach to school governance and administration as compared to the American approach? What policy implications, if any, can be drawn for American education?

Theoretical Framework

The major theoretical concepts guiding this study of Bavarian school administration and its implications for American education are what Merton (1968) and Willower (1970) refer to as "functional equivalents"; and what Kerr and Jermier (1978), Pitner (1988), Sergiovanni (1992) and others call "substitutes for leadership." In other words, if Bavarian school administration is so different from that in the United States (which is an empirical question addressed in this study), what are the "functional equivalents" or "substitutes for leadership" that make these differences possible?

As noted above, since the mid 1980s many school critics and educational researchers in the United States have focused their attention on the need for school restructuring, increased professionalism, and shared decisionmaking. Some such as Sergiovanni (1992) seek "substitutes for leadership" (p. 41); others may wish to save tax dollars by eliminating high-priced administrators; still others may simply wish to concentrate more funds directly on teaching. A review of relevant literature reveals a school system in Germany which appears highly successful and employs far fewer administrators than the American system. However, lest school boards or others conclude that the answer to America's educational problem is for each school or school district to simply divest itself of a few administrators, one must recall Willower's (1970) observation: "Merton regards as doomed to failure any attempt to eliminate an existing social structure without providing adequate alternative structures that fulfill the functions formerly fulfilled by the ones abolished" (p. 394).

Sergiovanni (1992) recognizes the focus currently placed on "direct leadership" (p. 41) in the current school reform literature, and favors "paying at least equal attention to providing

substitutes for leadership" (p. 41). While recognizing that professionalism is more than mere competence, Sergiovanni (1992) argues that "leadership becomes less urgent once the wheels of professionalism begin to turn by themselves" (p. 42). "The more professionalism is emphasized," writes Sergiovanni (1992), "the less leadership is needed. The more leadership is emphasized, the less likely it is that professionalism will develop" (p. 42). In this regard, Germany provides an especially apt comparison for the USA since teacher professionalism appears to be far more advanced there.

Consequently, this study seeks to draw comparisons to and seek implications for American school administration. To what extent can the Bavarian system illuminate the U.S.'s quest for increased professionalism, teacher empowerment, shared decisionmaking, and improved school administration? This study attempts to identify practices which might hold promise for American schools, but also considers cultural limitations militating against wholesale importation of German practices. The study's significance is heightened by the surprising fact that there appear to be no previous studies designed to compare continental European (i.e., non-British) models of educational administration with American models.

Design and Method of the Study

While one state cannot represent all of Germany, Bavaria is not only the largest of the 16 German states (*Länder*), but also has the second largest population. Moreover, its education system also resembles that of its neighbor, Baden-Württemberg. Nonetheless, under a federal system which relegates control in matters educational to the states, most findings presented should be viewed, strictly speaking, as Bavarian, rather than German. Although one cannot generalize from a small sample of schools in one large city, information available to the

researchers suggests that schools in the city selected are typical of those of Bavaria. To facilitate comparison of the types of schools in Germany with those in the United States, this study included elementary schools (*Grundschulen*) and representatives of the three main types of secondary schools (*Gymnasien*, *Realschulen*, and *Hauptschulen*). The sample in this study included three of each of the four types of schools, for a total of twelve schools. (A fourth type, the *Gesamtschule*, an experimental school combining *Hauptschule*, *Realschule*, and *Gymnasium* under one roof, was not included in the study. According to Monikes, 1984, less than 3% of all pupils in Germany attend this type of school.)

Data were collected in June and July 1993 (while schools were still in session) by means of interviews (in German) with school principals or headmasters and their assistants as well as other individuals performing administrative or quasi-administrative duties in the schools. Three to four people were interviewed in each school. To get a sense of the character of day-to-day school administration in these schools, the lead author observed one day in the life of school administrators in each of the four types of schools (a total of four days of observation). In addition, data were drawn from documents pertaining to administrative practice in Bavaria and in these schools. Key factors facilitating the lead author's ability to gain access and quickly understand the workings of these German schools were complete fluency in German and one full year and fifteen summers of experience in German schools.

The use of several sites and several informants at each offers a degree of triangulation. While the four days spent observing a day in the life of school administrators in each of the four types of schools clearly cannot provide Geertz' "thick description," these observations nonetheless provide a sense of the character of day-to-day school administration in these schools.

While far too brief to be a true Mintzberg-type study, the observations provide a preliminary basis for gaining a sense of whether the German principals' time allocation resembles that of Martin and Willower's (1981) and Kmetz and Willower's (1982) American principals.

The Schools and Their Leaders

The twelve schools visited are, first of all, representative of the tripartite nature of Bavarian elementary and secondary education: The researcher visited three *Grundschulen* (elementary schools), three *Gymnasien* (college-preparatory schools), three *Realschulen* (more practical; less theoretical than the *Gymnasien*), and three *Hauptschulen* (the so-called "main schools"—the school one must attend if one is unable—or does not wish—to qualify for attendance at either of the other two). Some of the schools were located in the inner city, with over fifty percent of their student population foreign children of asylum seekers and guest workers; some were in well-to-do sections of the city. Since Bavaria features municipal schools in addition to state schools, some of the schools selected were city, some state. One of the schools was founded twenty-five years ago, one dates from the sixteenth century. One of the *Gymnasien* was a new, experimental type, known as a European *Gymnasium*; another was a humanistic *Gymnasium* featuring classical languages; the third was a modern-language *Gymnasium*. At the suggestion of the Assistant Ministerial Deputy, one of the *Realschulen* was a Roman Catholic girls' school: In Bavaria, school administration, i.e., structures, forms, practices, etcetera, is determined by the state. Any private school, to be accredited, must adhere to all the rules and laws which apply to the public schools. To be sure, there are unaccredited private schools as well, but these schools are not permitted to give tests or exams; nor may they

grant degrees. The truly small number of students who attend these schools must take their tests and exams at a public school.

With municipal schools, state schools, and even one private religious school in the study, it seems now appropriate to examine salient aspects of these schools in somewhat greater detail. First it should be noted that the distinction between municipal and state schools only applies to the *Gymnasien* and *Realschulen*: The elementary schools and *Hauptschulen* are all state schools. (In discussing Bavaria's schools, it is often convenient to speak of a tripartite system. Here the *Grundschulen* and *Hauptschulen* are grouped together and referred to as *Volksschulen*.) In the city visited, all but one of the *Gymnasien* are state schools; all but one of the *Realschulen* are municipal. In all cases, the curriculum; the school code; and also that which one might find in individual school contracts and board policy in the United States are determined by the state's *Kultusministerium* in Munich—This applies equally to the state schools, the city schools, and to the Catholic girls' school. In all cases except that of the one religious school, the city is responsible for all noneducational costs: secretarial and custodial, building maintenance and repair, utilities, furniture, school supplies, etc. In the case of the private school, the given diocese is responsible for these noneducational costs, but even here the state contributes DM 100 per pupil toward these costs. Salaries of professional employees are borne by the state for state schools; by the city for municipal schools.

Although the *Kultusministerium* in Munich has authority over all educational matters as noted above, the way to Munich is not always direct. In the case of the *Gymnasien*, there is a Ministerial Deputy (*Ministerialbeauftragter*), a former *Oberstudiendirektor* or head of a *Gymnasium* for each large population area. He or she provides advice or assistance as needed

or requested, but the immediate superior of the *gymnasial* "principals" is the *Kultusministerium* itself. For the *Realschulen*, the school leader actually reports to the Ministerial Deputy (*Ministerialbeauftragter*). Leaders of the municipal *Realschulen* report to the Ministerial Deputy in educational matters, and in personnel matters to the mayor. In the case of the teachers in Bavaria's *Volksschulen*, there is an additional office, that of *Schulrat*. These school officials are the immediate superiors of "principals" of elementary and *Hauptschulen*. (Most respondents attributed this difference to historical reasons; some to the lesser educational training required of teachers at the *Volksschule*. Only one respondent, himself a *Schulrat*, explained that this distinction was primarily an organizational device required by the much larger number of schools and teachers in this category: Two out of every three teachers in Bavaria is a *Volksschullehrer* (Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung, 1992, p. 33; Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung, 1993a, p. 26; Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung, 1993b, p. 20).

As to the school leaders, the School Law of Bavaria (*Bayerisches Gesetz über das Erziehungs- und Unterrichtswesen*) says simply:

> (1) For every school, a person is to be appointed school leader; he or she is at the same time a teacher at this school.
>
> (2) The "principal" is responsible for orderly school operations and lessons as well as, together with the teachers, the education of students as well as for the supervision of compulsory education; he must keep informed regarding the delivery of instruction. In fulfillment of these assignments, he has authority over teachers, other pedagogical

personnel, as well as administrative and nonprofessional employees. He advises teachers and other professional personnel, and provides for their cooperation.

(3) The "principal" is the external representative of the school. (Art. 57 BayEUG)

Hence, it is *state law* that the school leader be a teacher and continue to teach. In general terms, the leaders' legal responsibilities as set forth in the code above are not unlike those of their American counterparts—except, perhaps, that the Bavarian school leaders are required by law to "provide for the cooperation" of "teachers and other professional personnel" (Art. 57 BayEUG).

With regard to the school leaders interviewed, four of the "principals" were women; the other eight were men. The eldest school leader was 58 at the time of the study, the youngest (and sole leader under 40) was 36.[2] The average age of these school leaders was 49; their experience in that position ranged from several months to 10 years. Six years was the average.

In terms of recruitment—the question, "How does one become a 'principal?'"—the response depends in part upon whether one is interested in a position in a state or municipal school and in part on the type of school in question. Otherwise, a similar answer was received from all of the respondents. Here, the words of one respondent, director of a state *Gymnasium*, mirror those of his colleagues:

> [T]heoretically anyone can become [a school leader]. [F]irst of all, all openings are published in the official newsletter of the Bavarian State Ministry for Education, Cultural Affairs, Science, and the Arts. And then, theoretically, everyone could apply, every teacher at a *Gymnasium*. At the *Gymnasium*, every teacher at the *Gymnasium*. If a [position at] a *Realschule* is advertised, only a teacher at a Realschule may apply. . . .

> A *Studienrat* (a teacher on the lowest rung on the career ladder) naturally has no chance, and he knows that. None apply. Basically, only the *Studiendirektoren* (teachers on the third rung) apply. . . . The Ministry has the personnel records in Munich. And then one looks at what kind of evaluations [the applicant] has, what kind of evaluations he has received every four years. Were they in the upper end of the scale?' Who else has applied? It is a competitive process. And then, the ministry in its boundless wisdom. . . [the respondent laughs and breaks off this sentence]. I was invited to Munich for a discussion [interview].

Those who make it through the paper screening are now invited to Munich for an interview in the *Kultusministerium*. Previously, the interview was not an integral part of the process—the data in one's personnel file sufficed: "In my day (1986), it was still the case that presenting oneself in the Ministry of Edu .ation was not customary" (*Oberstudiendirektor*, 1993).

In the case of a position at a city school, the city advertises the position. Following the posting of the position, as one "principal" of a municipal *Realschule* explains:

> The applications come to the personnel office. There [the applications] are internally sifted, and a series of perhaps eight, nine, or ten male and female applicants are selected. These are invited to a discussion [interview]. . . . And then . . . from the ten applicants, for example, three are selected. And these three, which then enter the last round, these three must then . . . . once again answer questions before the city council. And then the city council makes the final decision.

On the other hand, it is to the regional school administration that one applies for positions of leadership in the *Volksschule*.

Preparation or Anticipatory Socialization?

Whether one is a "principal" of a *Grundschule, Hauptschule, Realschule,* or *Gymnasium*, preparation for the position is quite unlike that found in America. Only one of the school leaders had had any formal training prior to assuming office. To the question "How is one prepared for the position of headmaster, one respondent replied, "One isn't *pre*pared, one is *post*pared." In fact, the formal "preparation" for the position nearly always occurs only after one has taken office, and consists of a two-week-long seminar. (This was the training afforded the single leader cited above.) On the other hand, these school leaders reported teaching experience (including the time in their present positions) ranging from 8 to 32 years; 23 years was the average.[4]

With regard to the leaders interviewed, in addition to their tenure in teaching, all had some previous experience with school administration. Of the twelve school leaders interviewed, eight had previously served as assistant "principals"; the others held positions ranging from department head, advisor to grades 10 through 13 (*Kollegstufenbetreuer*), and head of teacher training (*Seminarleiter*)—positions also held by many of those who had been assistant "principals."

In these schools, anticipatory socialization replaces university courses on the "principalship." To be sure, school administrators, whether in Germany or the United States, are recruited from the ranks of the teaching corps. Consequently, an investigation of school leaders should logically begin with the teaching pool from which they are drawn (or escape). In Germany, prospective teachers must first graduate from the selective *Gymnasium*, that is, successfully complete 13 grades and pass the *Abitur* (a rigorous school-leaving examination)

before attending the university. As part of the university program, future teachers complete an eight-week student-teaching experience. At this point, the German experience is not too unlike its American counterpart. Except of course, for the fact that a typical American high school is not particularly selective or academically rigorous, lasts but 12 years, and does not conclude with an *Abitur*. Nonetheless, having successfully completed student teaching, the American teacher is a full-fledged member of the teaching profession. In Germany, entry into the profession is not nearly as easy, for at the juncture described above, training is far from over:

> At the conclusion of this program, prospective teachers take the First State Examination, which is academic in nature. A second training period of two years follows the basic academic training period and emphasizes practical classroom skills and teaching competence. The prospective teacher must successfully pass the Second State Examination before being eligible to apply for a regular teaching position. The grades earned on this second examination influence the chances for securing a job and also partially determine the length of probationary period that will be required. . . . [I]n Germany, many teachers are twenty-eight to thirty years[5] old before they obtain their first teaching position. (McAdams, 1993, p. 111)

"In Germany, those who can, teach," maintains Theresa Waldrop (1991b); "some of the best and brightest German students are attracted to the field" (p. 62). Linda Darling-Hammond sees a sharp contrast in the professional training of teachers in the U.S. and Germany. In this regard, she says, "The way they educate their teachers makes a statement that teachers [in Germany] are valued and a valuable resource. . . . We do more or less the opposite here" (as quoted by Waldrop, 1991b). Kantrowitz and Wingert (1991) find teacher training in Germany

to be the best in the world. According to Waldrop (1991a) the German "high-school system [is] considered the best in the world" (p. 62). Kantrowitz and Wingert (1991) agree.

Richard P. McAdams (1993) studied schools and schooling in six countries—Canada, Denmark, England, Germany, Japan, and the United States—and found in Germany, "a higher regard for the teaching profession than is found in the United States" (p. 124). No doubt this is tied to "the requirements to become a teacher in Germany . . . , [which] are more stringent than teacher qualifications in the United States" (McAdams, 1993, p. 124). Moreover, while every secondary teacher in Germany is expected to be proficient in and, in fact, actually teach two academic subjects,[6] "nearly 17 percent of . . . [America's] one million public high school teachers have less than a college major or minor in the subject they teach most frequently" (Toch, 1991, p. 110).

The implications for administration and governance seem clear: While the better trained and more professional teachers in Germany can be expected to operate with little administrative direction or supervision, their American counterparts receive their marching orders from a whole cadre of district- and building-level supervisors and administrators. More often than not, these American supervisors and administrators, especially on a local level, have no German counterparts. Moreover, building-level administrators in Germany, unlike their American counterparts, continue to teach, albeit a reduced schedule.

In terms of the academic training of the leaders interviewed, the secondary school leaders (who must all major in—and teach—at least two subjects) cover such diverse areas as mathematics and physical education; Latin, Greek, and history; home economics and economics; history, German, and geography; mathematics and physics, and so on. Elementary school

teachers as well as those at the *Hauptschule* are generalists, and, with few exceptions, must be prepared to teach all subjects. (Exceptions include subjects such as foreign languages, religion, art, etc.)

Oberstudiendirektoren ("principals" of *Gymnasien*) teach the least (two periods a week in the schools visited); *Rektoren* of *Grundschulen* and *Hauptschulen* the most: Some teach but five or six periods fewer per week than their teachers. If one excludes the directors of the *Gymnasien*, the average weekly class load held by the school leaders was 13 hours. The assistant "principal" in a Gymnasium might teach half as many classes a regular teacher; an assistant "principal" in an elementary school typically enjoys but two periods released time per week. There are guidance counselors in these schools, and these specially trained teachers typically enjoy a reduced teaching load: one or two periods fewer per week than their non-counselling counterparts. (To facilitate comparison with American principals, the "secondary" schools, i.e., the *Gymnasien*, the *Realschulen*, and the *Hauptschulen* ranged between 770 and 276 students; with a mean of 516. The elementary schools had between 415 and 300 students; 365 was the average here.)

It is informative to note the extent to which these German school leaders continue to teach, and, to a large degree, the study represented a search for alternative administrative structures occasioned in part by second wave concerns for school governance. In this regard, it should be remembered that as long ago as 1961, Martin Mayer noted that there were fewer school administrators in Western Europe than in New York State (and fewer in France than in New York City). The lead researcher encountered no one in any of the schools (except for secretaries and custodians) who did not continue to teach. In fact, his question "How many

professional, but nonteaching staff members work in this school?" was met by a look of puzzlement. When the question was rephrased and asked again, he was told simply, "No one." (Compare this with the report recently released by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development cited by Viadero (1993): "The United States has the highest proportion of nonteaching staff members of the 19 industrialized nations studied"—"more than half of the education labor force in this country is not teaching in classrooms," p. 3).

The Role of the "Principal"

Each of the respondents was first asked what the position of school leader meant to her or him. "Much work," began the *Oberstudiendirektor* of a humanistic *Gymnasium*. The leader continued as follows:

> I don't see myself as a manager. And I also try to lead the school in a collegial fashion, that is, we are in a function where we are actually the superiors of people who have the same education as we, and who stand professionally on the same plane as we. It is more or less a, indeed, one could say, a coincidence that one is elevated to this position. However, . . . I feel especially responsible for this school.

One of his colleagues, however, represents the majority:

> For me, it means first of all the possibility to implement my own thoughts, ideas, [and] innovations with regard to organizational as well as administrative matters. Thus, the organization of lessons, representation [of the school], how one leads an enterprise, also with regard to technical aspects. But naturally also pedagogical ideas, educational questions. . . even if, of course, the school leader is, in no way, the supreme authority

in all questions. Basically, it is so that the teacher conference represents for many, many pedagogical questions the supreme authority.

What does this director's assistant think of the position?: "It's a management post, actually. Management with this pedagogical side: colleagues, parents, pupils. It is surely also a very demanding job. It is a difficult task."

In examining the role of the school leader in the schools visited, the researcher asked his respondents a number of pointed, yet open-ended questions in addition to the one posed above. Here again, some distinctions must be made between the types of schools, with the *Gymnasien* and *Realschulen* generally yielding similar responses, and the *Volksschulen* differing somewhat. The leaders of the first two categories see themselves as instructional leaders, and are charged with this role. They directly supervise staff and evaluate teachers. "Principals" of *Volksschulen* may observe teachers, but seldom do: The *Schulrat* is charged with the evaluation of teachers at these schools. In evaluation of testing and achievement, "principals" of *Gymnasien* and *Realschulen* are assisted by their department heads. In these schools, *every single test is reviewed by a department head* (*Fachleiter* or *Fachbetreuer*) who judges the test for pedagogical appropriateness and congruence to the curriculum, and also evaluates the degree to which students have mastered the material. The department head's summary findings, along with the tests themselves, are then reviewed by the "principal." This process is followed for all tests. Follow-up conferences are held with individual teachers as needed. This tight control is not found in the other school types. However, all but the *Grundschulen* conclude with high-stakes exams for students, exams which are produced by the *Kultusministerium*. The ministry also sets the standard by which the non-machine-scorable, non-multiple-choice exams will be graded. All

of these exams have a first and second corrector. Thus, the ministry holds a tight rein on standards, and forces accountability.

In all schools, the disciplining of students is primarily a function of the individual teacher. Backing up the teacher is first the assistant "principal" and then the "principal." (In the case of the elementary schools, the offending youngster most likely would be sent directly to the *Rektor*, not his or her assistant who must still teach 25 period per week.) However, as with all matters delegated, the ultimate responsibility for student discipline rests with the school leader.

Scheduling, too, is ultimately the responsibility of the school leader, although in virtually all of the schools visited, it devolves upon either an assistant or a classroom teacher (usually one with some computer expertise). Here, it should be noted that while the subaltern may construct the schedule, it is the "principal" who approves its content.

In terms of budget and finance, none of the school leaders must consider personnel in terms of costs. Personnel, that is the number of teachers, assistants, secretaries, etc., depends upon the number of students enrolled—as does the number of nonteaching hours available to release administrators and quasi-administrators from their teaching duties. Salaries are totally outside the school administrators' sphere of control or interest. The other major aspect of budgeting and finance, the nonteaching side, is also dependent upon school enrollment. In the secondary schools visited, school and teaching supplies were usually delegated to the assistant; maintenance and other such items to the head custodian (*Hausmeister*).

Public and community relations are directly a concern of the school leader in the secondary school. As the school law states, "The school leader is the external representative

of the school" (Art. 57 BayEUG). Nonetheless, each of the school leaders in the elementary schools visited suggested that any media coverage, however rare, would be channeled through his or her *Schulrat*. Here, yet another distinction among the schools should be noted: The *Volksschulen* are neighborhood schools; the *Gymnasien* and *Realschulen* are not. If students meet entrance requirements, they are free to select the *Gymnasium* or *Realschule* that best meets their needs. Consequently, public relations, however regulated and subdued by American standards, plays a greater role in these institutions than in the *Volksschulen*.

When comparing the role of the school leader in public and community relations and in budget and finance with that of his or her American counterpart, several additional points should be brought out and underscored. First and foremost, *there are no lay boards of education*. No referenda on school budgets. No taxpayer reform groups. No "savage inequalities," to borrow Kozol's (1991) title. In this regard everyone interviewed was asked to describe the role of parents and taxpayers in school affairs. Their answers are quite telling.

Most of the individuals felt that parents play a large role in school affairs. When asked to describe the role parents play, respondents referred to the Parents' Advisory Board (*Elternbeirat*). Indeed, the Parents' Advisory Board is anchored in school law: Article 64 of the Bavarian Law on Education and Instruction calls for the establishment of such an institution at each school, and describes its composition. Article 67 spells out its operation:

> (1) The school leader informs the Parents' Advisory Board at the earliest possible moment regarding all matters which are of general significance for the school. He provides information necessary for the work of the Board.

> (2) The school leader, school office, and the municipality, within the range of their authority, examine the suggestions of the Board within an appropriate time frame, and inform the Board of their decision; whereby in the case of a rejection, reasons are to be given—upon request, in writing. (Art. 67 BayEUG)

Upon further questioning, the respondents described a Parents' Advisory Board whose involvement was largely limited to festivals and celebrations. When queried as to the involvement of parents in pedagogical matters, the informants generally looked puzzled, and responded much like this *Oberstudiendirektor*:

> The Parents' Advisory Board is an institution for advice or often to represent the opinion of the parents, but the possibility of influence in the pedagogical sphere is zero. One respects opinions, and also takes them into consideration, but parents cannot interfere with the content of lessons or the level of achievement and so on.

Ironically, most respondents, based on their initial response to the question regarding parents, judged their role to be large. This was clearly not the case when they were asked about taxpayers: "Taxpayers?" the researcher was asked, as if he had said "antelopes" or "cauliflower." "Taxpayers—none at all." School decisions are made by school people. In terms of these school people, the *Schulrat* interviewed was asked, "How does one become a *Schulrat*?" to which he responded, "One must have taught for at least twenty years, and received very good grades."[7])

With regard to the role of the school leader in decisionmaking in general, it will be noted that in the Bavarian schools much less discretionary power is left to the individual schools than in America. Of course, major consequences are that standards are universally high and a

uniform curriculum is taught and learned. Within the sphere left to the individual school, many important decisions are made by the "teacher conference," which is a kind of faculty senate found in Bavarian schools. In the words of the director cited earlier, "The teacher conference represents for many, many pedagogical questions the supreme authority."

Here, too, the school law is quite explicit: "At every school there is a teacher conference. . . . At schools with more than 25 full-time teachers, a disciplinary committee and a committee on teaching supplies and learning materials . . . will be formed for the duration of a school year" (Art. 58 BayEUG). Section two of the same article describes membership in the teacher conference: all professional employees. Sections three and four are more to the point:

> (3) The teacher conference has the task of guaranteeing the educational and instructional work as well as the collegial and pedagogical cooperation of the school's teachers. The assignments of the school leader and the pedagogical responsibility of the individual teacher remain intact.
>
> (4) The teacher conference decides, *with binding force on the school leader and the remaining members of the teacher conference*, those matters which through legal and administrative rules are left to its discretion.[8] In other matters, decisions taken by the teacher conference are recommendations. (Art. 58 BayEUG, emphasis added)

Section five provides an escape hatch: It details the steps to be taken if "the school leader is of the opinion that the decision of the teacher conference violates law or administrative rules, or [if] he cannot accept the responsibility for the execution of the decision" (Art. 58 BayEUG).

The "Principals" at Work

The single day spent with one school leader in each of the four types of school hardly lends itself to comparison with the work of Mintzberg (1968), Martin and Willower (1981), or Kmetz and Willower (1982). While Mintzberg observed five chief executives of large organizations for one week each, Martin and Willower (1981) applied Mintzberg's technique of structured observation to five high school principals for one week each, and Kmetz and Willower (1982) observed elementary school principals. Of his managers, Mintzberg (1968) wrote:

> The manager performs a great quantity of work at an unrelenting pace; his activities are varied and brief, and there is little continuity between successive activities; he exhibits a preference for issues that are current, specific and ad hoc, and a preference for the verbal means of communication. . . . (p. 3)

Similarly, Martin and Willower's (1981) principals "engaged in a large number of activities and they performed their work at a rapid pace. The types of tasks they performed were many and varied, and interruptions were frequent. Most of the principals' activities involved verbal communication . . . " (p. 86).

In attempting to compare the workdays of the school leaders in the current study with those of Martin and Willower (1981) and Kmetz and Willower (1982), one must consider to what extent the days spent with these school leaders were "typical." "There is no such thing as a typical day for a school leader," replied one *Oberstudiendirektor*. Yet the one *Oberstudiendirektor* observed volunteered that the day in question had been rather typical. The elementary school "principal," on the other hand, felt that the day of the visit had been much quieter than most. While difficult to evaluate, it should be noted that, on the strength of this

particular visit, Kmetz and Willower's (1982) assertion that "the elementary principals' pace was less hectic" than that of secondary principals becomes quite an understatement (p. 62).

On the day of the visit to the elementary school, the school secretary was out sick: All calls went directly to the "principal." There were but two incoming calls. The "principal" made no calls herself. Her desk work was interrupted by these two phone calls, an unscheduled visit from a teacher with a question, and the three classes she taught on the day of the visit. To the degree to which the day observed was typical, it is easy to see how elementary "principals" can still teach circa 15 hours per week.

In each of the three remaining schools, much more varied activity was observed. The visit to the Catholic girls' school began with a tenth grade assembly called for the purpose of discussing the final school-leave-taking exam. Following the assembly, the "principal" taught two classes. Barely back in her office, she was interrupted by an incoming telephone call. While she was on the telephone, two students arrived with a problem. After tending to paperwork on her desk for a scant five minutes, the first school-wide break began, and with it, a steady stream of students (four) and a teacher appeared with individual questions or requests.

Following the break, the "principal" was able to work at her desk uninterruptedly for approximately one and one-half hours. A new series of interruptions followed. There was a brief incoming telephone call (one minute in duration). A parent with a question about an end-of-year activity stopped by (for one minute). A teacher with a question visited the "principal" (also for one minute). Finally, another teacher arrived. The "principal" and she discussed the work of a student for five minutes.

The day spent with the *Rektor* of a *Hauptschule* was the first day of the exams for the *qualifizierender Hauptschulabschluß*, the school-leaving examination for this type of school—in simplistic terms an *Abitur* for the *Hauptschule*. Consequently, at least part of the day was somewhat atypical.

At 7:35 A.M., the lead researcher met the "principal" on the sidewalk as he arrived at school. The assistant was already at work in the office they share. The "principal" and his assistant discussed teacher absences, and then began a discussion of the *qualifizierender Hauptschulabschluß*. In the next fifteen minutes, seven teachers arrived. All joined in the discussion of the exam. The teachers, the *Rektor*, and his assistant were assembled around the double desk of the "principal" and his assistant. Most used the familiar form of address. Four were wearing jeans. The "principal" was smoking a pipe; three of the five teachers were smoking cigarettes—the first in-school smoking seen on this trip. The atmosphere was much more relaxed and collegial than that encountered in the other schools.

All looked over and discussed the tests. (These tests are the same for all *Hauptschulen* in Bavaria. For the German exam, for example, the ministry writes three tests. Individual schools must eliminate one of the three choices; all students within each individual school may choose between the two remaining tests.) Discussion of which test to eliminate continued. There seemed to be agreement that one of the tests appeared to be more difficult for the school's foreign students. (Forty percent of the school's students are foreign.) The *Rektor* strove to gain consensus. Several argued that one test seemed easier than it was—They were afraid that many of their students would select this one and do poorly. The "principal" reminded his colleagues that this was the *qualifizierender Abschluß*, the *qualifying* diploma.

At 8:15, a vote was taken: This school's students would be able to choose between the second and third tests. At 8:30, the *Rektor* left to proctor exams. The researcher was not permitted to accompany the "principal." Instead, he was given copies of today's and previous years' exams to examine. At 8:40, the assistant left to teach a class. The *Rektor* returned at 9:25. No sooner had he sat down at his desk, when the secretary entered with a problem. After quickly dispatching the problem, the "principal" attempted to return a telephone call, but was unable to reach his party. He worked briefly at his desk. At 9:30, the secretary entered with yet another question. And so it continued. At one point, the "principal" managed to work at his desk (mostly on end-of-year activities) for one hour and five minutes without interruption. Otherwise, the longest uninterrupted stretch of desk work was less than five minutes long. Several brief conversations were held with teachers, his assistant, and his secretary; only one was with a student. The "principal" made two telephone calls, and received one (from the *Schulrat*, his superior). The call lasted ten minutes. This "principal" continued to teach thirteen periods per week.

His colleague, the "principal" of the *Gymnasium* visited, taught only two classes per week. His day began with a tour of the school at 7:00, followed by thirty minutes at his desk. At 7:45, he joined students in the school's tiny chapel for the voluntary Friday devotions. (Friday services alternate weekly between Roman Catholic and Protestant faiths, and are held by the school's religion teachers.) The "principal" attends "regardless of the faith, several times a month."

By 8:00, the "principal" was back in his office. He was greeted by his secretary, who asked if she should treat this day as an ordinary day, or if he wanted her to hold calls, etc. She

was told to treat this day as any other. The "principal" and the lead researcher left to observe a teacher. The observation was followed by ten minutes of desk work unrelated to the observation. (This segment was spent on a student's application to spend a year in the United States.) Following an incoming telephone call, the *Direktor* continued work at his desk, now checking over several sets of tests which had been submitted by various department heads (*Fachleiter*).

The secretary interrupted this work to discuss the school's graduation invitations. All of the invitations had been addressed to the graduating students themselves: Correspondence relating to students over 18 must be sent directly to the students, not their parents. However, they did not really want to invite the students to their own graduation celebration; they wanted to invite the parents. Since mail is not sent to parents, they did not even have a set of address labels for them. The decision was made to send the invitations as they were, but to change the procedure next year.

The *Direktor* returned to his desk. He worked on a letter to parents of younger students regarding end-of-year activities, and began work on a letter inviting "new" parents, that is, parents of students who will attend the *Gymnasium* for the first time in the fall, to the annual *Schulfest*. After five minutes, he left his office, and returned with his assistant. Together they discussed the letter to the parents. After several minutes, they were interrupted by the *Kollegstufenbetreuer* (advisor to the upper-level grades), who had questions regarding several students' grades on the *Abitur*. This conversation continued for five minutes. The previous discussion between the two leaders resumed, and the issue was resolved by 9:45 when the *Direktor* left to teach a math class.

Upon his return to the office, he led a planned meeting that lasted twenty minutes. (Present at the meeting were the *Direktor*, his assistant, and the *Kollegstufenbetreuer*.) Following the meeting, ten minutes were devoted to the dictation of yet another letter. Following this, the next half hour saw eight interruptions: secretary → teacher → teacher → secretary → teacher → incoming telephone call. The call was from the local newspaper regarding the school's graduation celebration, and lasted fifteen minutes. The assistant returned with some of the students' corrected exam papers (portions of the *Abitur*). The *Direktor* then made a fifteen minute telephone call. The telephone call was followed by the day's only direct encounter with a student: a member of the student government (*Die Schülermitveranwortung*) with questions regarding the annual student graduation prank.

Unlike the leaders of the other kinds of schools, the *Oberstudiendirektor* is assisted by a whole panoply of class and subject leaders each of whom is striving to climb the ladder from *Studienrat*, to *Oberstudienrat*, to *Studiendirektor*. While most of these positions offer additional salary and increased involvement in the administration of the school, few provide more than one or two periods of released time per week. Additionally, *Gymnasiallehrer* (teachers at a *Gymnasium*) enjoy higher salaries and a lighter teaching load than their colleagues in the other schools (23 periods per week versus twenty-seven for the *Grundschullehrer*).

School leaders of *Realschulen* are also assisted by various teachers performing duties such as subject coordinators and so on, but for these teachers there exists only a small block of released time; no career ladder with additional remuneration. Leaders of *Grundschulen* or *Hauptschulen* must rely on volunteers. Here there are few released periods even for the school leader and his or her assistant. Of course, in the *Volksschule*, many administrative duties, e.g.,

evaluation, are performed by external administrators such as the *Schulräte*. To be sure, absent other extrinsic rewards, some extra duties are accomplished out of a sense of professionalism; others may be performed as a means to a future leadership position.

Preliminary Conclusions

The researchers feel that this research suggests a variety of factors which, strictly speaking, are not functional equivalents for American administrative practices, yet do explain a system which functions quite well in spite of what American school leaders might find to be an "unbearable lightness" of administration.

- The German teachers are much better trained and educated than their American counterparts. The selection process is much more rigorous. Student teaching lasts two years, is preceded by a first state exam, and followed up by a second state exam. Beginning teachers are frequently in their thirties.
- Teachers are evaluated on a scale which places emphasis on exceeding the basic requirements. One is not deemed perfect until one does something which can be documented as wrong; rather one must exceed the basic requirements of the assignment if one is to advance.
- Since teachers are evaluated only every four years, and one must have at least two successive superior ratings in order to become a "principal," school leaders are experienced classroom teachers with proven ability.
- In spite of cultural diversity brought about by sizeable non-German populations, there seems to be much greater agreement as to the role of the schools, what should be taught, etcetera. While the schools have little say in matters of curriculum, neither do

teachers spend countless hours writing and rewriting curriculum—the *Lehrplan* comes from the Ministry of Education in Munich.

- There are no lay boards of education: Policy is set by professional educators in the *Kultusministerium*, and all students must meet uniformly high standards.
- There is strict academic accountability.
- In addition to uniformly high standards and strict accountability, Bavarian secondary schools must also compete: Parents and students are free to "shop" for the *Realschule* or *Gymnasium* that best meets their needs. (The *Volksschulen* are neighborhood schools.)
- Teachers are civil servants, paid roughly the same all over Germany. They may not strike, but neither are they forced to collectively bargain or beg. They occupy respected positions in society, and are relatively well paid.
- Schools operate free from budget referenda and taxpayer revolts: There is no separate and, therefore, vulnerable school tax.
- The gross inequities ever present in American education are absent in German schools: Expenses directly related to education, e.g., teacher and administrative salaries, are paid by the state; building expenses by the city.
- There are no behemoth "factory schools" in Bavaria. Two thousand students in one school is considered much too large; under one thousand optimal. According to a ministry official, no elementary school or *Hauptschule* in Bavaria has more than 700 students. Directly tied to the size of the school is number of noninstructional hours allocated by the Ministry for administration.

Each of the above factors can help explain a school system which operates quite successfully with but a fraction of the full-time administrators typically found in an American school. The education and training of teachers, and the requirement that administrators have proven ability in the classroom and in quasi-administrative functions, help explain the success of administrators who are trained in their new roles only after they are named to their positions.

Implications for U.S. Schools

Even before discussing the implications of the Bavarian model for U.S. schools, several salient points must be underscored. School governance in the U.S. is fragmented into roughly 15,000 school districts, while in Germany, there are but 16 state ministries of education. There are administrators charged with, say, curriculum and instruction, but nowhere near 15,000 of them. In fact, what is clearly missing is the entire district apparatus: lay boards of education, superintendents, deputy superintendents, assistant superintendents, subject supervisors, business managers and their staffs, solicitors, transportation and food service directors, etc. Administration within the individual schools, might appear to mirror the American model, but it is but a faint reflection: No one leads without continuing to teach. Few of the various quasi-administrators discussed above enjoy more than one or two period per week released from teaching. Assistant "principals" at the *Gymnasium* teach roughly half as many classes as an ordinary teacher; assistant "principals" in an elementary school still teach twenty-five classes per week.

To be sure, it is difficult to precisely quantify the impact that the dual role of administrator-teacher has on the leaders' various constituencies (or even on the leaders themselves). Clearly, it tends to keep them in touch, especially, in the *Volksschulen* and

Realschule, but even in the *Gymnasien*. The Bavarian school leaders insist that they are teachers first and foremost, "*primus inter pares*," as several commented. Even if they teach only two classes per week as is the case with the *Oberstudiendirektoren*, they still have a better sense for what their students are like, as one *Seminarlehrer* (teacher of student teachers) pointed out. They can better assess the impact of administrative decisions. Moreover, they gain credence with teachers, students, and parents alike. But above all, they serve to underscore the organization's main mission: teaching. By continuing to teach, they reject the American hierarchy which places teaching on the bottom rung of a rather limited career ladder—a ladder which quickly takes its climber out of the classroom entirely.

Of course, the point is not that the role of leader is absent in the schools of Bavaria, but rather that clear standards and a much higher degree of teacher professionalism lessen the need for direct leadership. Sergiovanni (1992) has noted, "leadership becomes less urgent once the wheels of professionalism begin to turn by themselves" (p. 42). "The more professionalism is emphasized," writes Sergiovanni (1992), "the less leadership is needed. The more leadership is emphasized, the less likely it is that professionalism will develop" (p. 42). Unfortunately, it does not follow that the less leadership is emphasized, the more professionalism develops. Absent a high level of competence and professionalism, leadership remains quite urgent. As Nelson and O'Brien (1993) recognize, "By international standards, U.S. high school teachers are undertrained . . . ; too many high school teachers get master's degrees well after they begin their teaching career *and outside their field of teaching*" (p. 78; emphasis added). Nelson and O'Brien call for increased training, "training that would culminate in the passage of rigorous

state or national examinations" (p. 78). The research in the twelve Bavarian schools clearly supports this need.

In Germany, more controlled entry into the profession and delayed awarding of tenure are wedded to a system of evaluation that requires more than minimal competence. Additionally, in the *Gymnasium*, there is a well defined and thoroughly established career ladder. Teachers strive to move from *Referendar* to *Studienrat*; from *Studienrat* to *Oberstudienrat*; and from *Oberstudienrat* to *Studiendirektor*.[9] Not all succeed, and not all advance at the same rate. Unlike the typical American pay scale based on seniority and additional graduate credits, the system in place in Bavaria evaluates teachers on a scale which emphasizes exceeding the basic requirements of the position. One is not deemed perfect until one does something which can be documented as wrong; rather one must *exceed* the basic requirements of the assignment if one is to advance.

As noted above, there are no lay boards of education in Bavaria, nor is educational governance throughout Germany fragmented into anywhere near 15,000 separate districts. Educational policy is set on the state level by highly competent and experienced professionals. Parental influence on standards, curriculum, and pedagogy is quite minimal. Taxpayer influence is virtually nil. A clear prerequisite for the German model is a critical mass of highly competent and experienced professionals.

Chubb and Moe (1990) are clear in their condemnation of "the [U.S.] system's familiar arrangements for direct democratic control" (p. 21). As they explain, "this structure tends to promote organizational characteristics that are ill-suited to the effective performance of American public schools" (p. 21). Thurow (1992) concurs, but is more to the point:

> Consider the fifteen-thousand-plus independently elected local school boards that run America's schools—the ultimate in Jeffersonian local democracy. If an educational system that allows thousands of local school boards to run schools was a good one, one might reasonably expect that at least one of those fifteen thousand school systems could turn out high-school graduates whose achievements could match those of Europe or Japan. None can. (p. 259)

The ministry sets and enforces high standards for all teachers, schools, and students. Thurow (1992) underscores the importance of these standards, noting that "no one turns out a high quality product unless someone sets quality standards" (p. 262). While Bavarian teachers are following the state curriculum, practicing approved assessment measures (which in the case of the *Gymnasium* are checked by department chair and the "principal"), their American colleagues are marching to the beat of a different drummer.

Surprisingly, grades, the external and putative manifestation of achievement, are remarkably evenly distributed throughout the United States, without respect for students' socio-economic levels. Indeed, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education (1994) has found, for example, that the percentage of students earning A's and B's is fairly constant, regardless of the school's poverty level.[10] Tragically, however, for the schools themselves, the credibility of the educational enterprise itself, and, above all, for the students concerned, no similar correspondence can be found concerning the *achievement* which these grades are supposed to represent. According to the OERI (1994), in math, "the 'A' students in the high poverty schools most closely resembled the 'D' students

in the most affluent schools" (p. 3). In reading, the high poverty students' A's corresponded to C's and D's in the more affluent schools.

Whether the preceding situation results merely from benign neglect coupled with well meaning obfuscation or deliberate discrimination and fraud, it is the almost inevitable result of the American system's local control and lack of clear standards. "In the United States," writes Shanker (1993),

> there is no consensus about what students should know and be able to do except in the most general terms. . . . The answer to these questions will vary according to where you ask them, because our 15,000 school districts and 50 states all have rights and responsibilities in the area of curriculum. . . . [W]hen there are no external standards, standards are often set by individual teachers. This absence of clear and agreed-upon standards leads to a crazy non-system of curricula and requirements and tests. (pp. 90–91)

Thurow (1992) provides the contrast: "The world's best school systems operate under a strong centralized ministry of education that sets tough standards that everyone must meet" (p. 262). Here, while Goodlad (1984) argued against top-down management in U.S. schools, he also cautioned not "to dismantle completely the educational system, leaving tens of thousands of schools to float free from all external directives and restraints," for "most of these schools would fall victim to fad, fashion, orthodoxy, incompetence, and local politics" (p. 274).

Two apparently competing strands begin to emerge, and sometimes *coexist* beneficially: on the one hand, less direct leadership and increased professionalism; on the other, centralized ministries of education which establish educational policy and rigorous standards. This tension

between impulses toward bottom-up professionalism and, at the same time, top-down central control is a theme in international school reform. However, the contradiction which at first appears is more imagined than real. As Boyd (1992) explains:

> The contradiction depends on the traditional assumption [that] the power relationship—and the balance between centralization and decentralization of authority—are *zero sum games*, that is relationships in which gain for one side meant a corresponding loss for the other side. Recent research on school reform in the United States (Fuhrman & Elmore, 1990) shows this assumption is not necessarily correct. (p. 754; emphasis in the original)

What seems abundantly clear from the research in the Bavarian schools is that these schools function extremely well within a framework of fairly tight external control, while at the same time enjoying strong professionalism among educators *and* freedom from the petty meddling and all-pervasive micromanagement that all too often plagues their American counterparts.

Conclusions

This research on school administration in Bavaria further underscores the need for fundamental and *systemic* reform (Smith & O'Day, 1991) in the United States. If we recall Merton (1968) and Willower's (1970) caution, we will recognize the folly of further tinkering around the edges of our educational system, of trying to substitute individual pieces. If we suggest, for example, that salaries should be raised (and be made more consistent) in order to attract better teachers, it is clearly equally imperative that standards for teachers be raised as well. On the other hand, world-class standards for teachers can be expected to fall short of the

mark in the absence of massive changes in administration and governance. Standards for students must also be raised, and can no longer depend on the whim and whimsy of 15,000 local communities (or worse, individual schools). America also needs, as Germany has, higher societal expectations and increased employer requirements for high student achievement. This component of the "system" is essential to motivate students to take advantage of increased learning opportunities. However, one cannot reasonably expect student performance to even approach expectations for achievement without a massive improvement in the teaching corps. A career ladder, as in the Bavarian model, presupposes clear standards and high expectations as well as administrators capable of recognizing quality. The wheels of professionalism cannot begin to turn without professionals at the wheel. For insights into more professionalized systems of schooling that peacefully, and indeed productively, coexist with strong national standards, Americans can learn much by more attention to systems of education in other nations.[11]

References

Bayerisches Gesetz über das Erziehungs- und Unterrichtswesen (1994).

Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung. (1992). *Die allgemeinbildenden Schulen in Bayern Schuljahr 1991/92: Volksschulen*. Munich: Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung.

Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung. (1993a). *Die allgemeinbildenden Schulen in Bayern Schuljahr 1992/93: Gymnasien*. Munich: Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung.

Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung. (1993b). *Die allgemeinbildenden Schulen in Bayern Schuljahr 1992/93: Realschulen*. Munich: Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung.

Bayerischer Philologenverband. (1992). *Handbuch für Mitglieder*. Munich: Bayerischer Philologenverband.

Boyd, W. L. (1987). Public education's last hurrah?: Schizophrenia, amnesia, and ignorance in school politics. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9*, 85-100.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century* (Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession). New York: Author.

Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (199). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Fuhrman, S. H., & Elmore, R. F. (1990). Understanding local control in the wake of state education reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12*, 82-96.

Holmes Group, Inc. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Kantrowitz, B., & Wingert, P. (1991, December 2). The best schools in the world. *Newsweek*, pp. 51-52.

Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Performance*, *22*, 375-403.

Kmetz, J. T., & Willower, D. J. (1982). Elementary school principals' work behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *18*, 62-78.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Crown.

Martin, W. J., & Willower, D. J. (1981). The managerial behavior of high school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *17*, 69-90.

McAdams, R. P. (1993). *Lessons from abroad: How other countries educate their children*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1968). *The manager at work—Determining his activities, roles, and programs by structured observation* (Doctoral dissertation, M.I.T.).

Monikes, W. (1984). The school system in the Federal Republic of Germany. In W. von Busch, & O. Akalin (Eds.), *Bildung und Wissenschaft*. Bonn: Inter Nationes. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 664)

National Center for Education Statistics. (1993). *America's teachers: Profile of a profession* (NCES No. 93-025). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Governors Association. (1986). *Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education*. Washington, DC: Author.

Nelson, F. H., & O'Brien, T. (1993). *How U.S. teachers measure up internationally: A comparative study of teacher pay, training, and conditions of service*. New York: The American Federation of Teachers.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1994). *What do student grades mean? Differences across schools* (OR 94-3401). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Pitner, N.J. (1988). The study of administrator effects and effectiveness. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*. New York: Longman.

Schulordnung für Gymnasien: Schulordnung für die Gymnasien in Bayern—Gymnasialschulordnung (GSO) und Bayerisches Erziehungs- und Unterrichtsgesetz (BayEUG) (1992). Kronach: Carl-Link Verlag.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. *Educational Leadership*, *49*(5), 41-45.

Shanker, A. (1983). The first real crisis. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 471-483). New York: Longman.

Shanker, A. (1993). The task before us. In S. Elam (Ed.), *The state of the nation's public schools*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Smith, M., & O'Day, J. (1991). Systemic school reform. In S. Fuhrman & B. Malen (Eds.), *The politics of curriculum and testing*. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Thurow, L. (1992). *Head to head: The coming economic battle among Japan, Europe, and America*. New York: William Morrow.

Toch, T. (1991). *In the name of excellence: The struggle to reform the nation's schools, why it's failing, and what should be done*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Viadero, D. (1993, December 8). Majority of education workforce found to be non-teachers. *Education Week*, p. 3.

Waldrop, T. (1991a, December 2). High school: They are engineered like no other students in the world. *Newsweek*, pp. 61-62.

Waldrop, T. (1991b, December 2). Teacher training: Before you lead a class, you must really know your stuff. *Newsweek*, pp. 62-63.

Willower, D. J. (1970). Educational change and functional equivalents. *Education and Urban Society*, *2*, 385-402.

Footnotes

[1]This is a revised and updated version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 1994.

[2]In considering this single school leader under the age of forty, several additional points should also be mentioned. This particular individual is the leader of the sole non-public school included in the study. Here, it will be recalled that the lead researcher included this school upon the suggestion of the Assistant Ministerial Deputy only after confirming the appropriateness of the choice with other school leaders. In the course of the interview, the lead researcher was able to confirm the many similarities which exist among accredited private schools and the public schools. He also discovered that this particular school shared a campus with a Roman Catholic *Gymnasium*. Officially, the head of the *Gymnasium* was also the head of the *Realschule*. In fact, however, by his own as well as other accounts, the individual interviewed ran the *Realschule* even though officially, she was an assistant. Nonetheless, this additional information explains the discrepancy in age.

[3]Teachers are evaluated according to the following rubrics:

Outstanding (*Hervorragend*)

Very Capable (*Sehr tüchtig*)

Exceeds Requirements Considerably (*Übertrifft erheblich die Anforderungen*)

Exceeds Requirements (*Übertrifft die Anforderungen*)

Meets the Requirements Fully (*Entspricht voll den Anforderungen*)

Does Not Fully Meet the Requirements (*Entspricht noch den Anforderungen*)

Does Not Meet the Requirements (*Entspricht nicht den Anforderungen*) (Bayerischer Philologenverband, 1992, pp. 26–28)

[4]Please refer to note two above. The leader with the least experience is the individual discussed in the previous note. Excluding her, two individuals are tied for lowest seniority: each with seventeen years.

[5]Data are available concerning the age of the current teaching force. According to the Bavarian State Office of Statistics, in the school year 1992-93, of a total of 29,768 secondary, i.e., *Realschul-* or *Gymnasiallehrer*, in that state only 577 or 1.9 percent were under the age of thirty (Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung, 1993a, p. 33; Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung, 1993b, p. 20). Among the state's 44,902 *Volksschullehrer*, one finds that 6.7 percent are under the age of thirty (Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung, 1992, p. 26). Only in the category of *Volksschullehrer* is a separate category given for teachers under the age of twenty-five: In 1991-92, of 44,902 elementary school teachers in Bavaria, only 101 were under the age of twenty-five (Bayerisches Landesamt für Statistik und Datenverarbeitung, 1992, p. 26). Comparison is difficult because the National Center for Education Statistics' 1993 publication of *America's Teachers: Profile of a Profession* provides data for only 1987-88. Nonetheless, in that year, 14.4 percent of America's elementary teachers were under the age of thirty; 12.7 percent of secondary teachers were also (p. 11).

[6]Exceptions are teachers of music and art in a *Gymnasium* who teach only one subject.

[7]"*Sehr gute Noten*"—Very good grades. The German word for grades, *Noten*, applies both to the grades one receives in courses (and on exams), and to the grades one receives on one's teaching evaluations. All of these grades continue to play a role in determining the rate

and even possibility of advancement. In other words, a low grade on, say, the second state examination may well serve as a permanent road block to career advancement years later.

Student grades are based on a scale of one to six, with one being defined as "very good," and six as "unsatisfactory." The fact that five is already "failing" should serve to help indicate that the numbers do not easily translate into American letters. In reality, a German 1 is nearly flawless, zero mistakes on a hundred-word foreign language dictation, for example. A 6 in a single course requires the student to repeat the entire year. Two 6's in a row, and one must say "Auf Wiedersehen" to the *Gymnasium* or *Realschule*.

[8]According to Section VII, § 90 of the School Code for *Gymnasien* in Bavaria, "The teacher conference decides . . .

1. disagreements with administrative acts of the school;
2. complaints of fundamental significance against the general instructional and educational measures of the school. . . .
3. events which involve the entire school.

Similar language is found in the codes governing the other types of schools.

[9]In terms of the career ladder, leaders and most teachers in the *Volksschulen* and *Realschulen*, indeed, even the *Schulrat*, expressed deep resentment over the fact that this ladder was not available to them. Some of this resentment is financial; some rests on the lack of challenge and growth potential; still other reflects the leaders' frustration in not being able to reward teachers for exceeding minimum requirements.

As the *Schulrat* points out, teachers in the *Gymnasium* start out one salary class higher than their counterparts in the *Volksschule*. The *Rektor* at a smaller *Volksschule* is on the same

pay level as a beginning teacher at a *Gymnasium*; the *Rektor* of a larger *Volksschule* is only one step higher than the beginning teacher at a *Gymnasium*, for whom there is a career ladder which allows him or her to climb from *Studienrat* (salary level A 13) to *Oberstudienrat* (A 14—the same as the *Rektor* of a large *Volksschule*), to *Studiendirektor* (A 15), and finally to *Oberstudiendirektor* (A 16). The teacher at a *Volksschule* remains at A 12 unless or until he or she becomes a "principal." (Unless the *Volksschullehrer* teaches typing, physical education, or home economics—these teachers begin at A 10.)

The *Rektorin* of one of the *Hauptschulen* visited was concerned primarily with the impact this system exerts in limiting her ability to lead her school:

> There is only my assistant with three periods [of released time per week] and I, as administrator of the school, with ten. Everything else is done by the teachers on a more or less voluntary basis. Therefore, they must be continuously supervised. However, this is a task which almost impossible.

Her colleague, the *Rektor* of another *Hauptschule* is even more forceful. According to this school leader,

> the problem of the *Hauptschule* [is] its disadvantaged position vis-à-vis career opportunities. The *Volksschullehrer* has no career path . . . , for he starts out A 12. He has no possibility of promotion, none at all. Except for the "principalship," he leaves as a regular teacher, without change of title, without a change in his salary level, again at A 12. This is an extremely unfortunate situation. . . . It has two sides—only one negative, because the good people, and there are very many, there are very many very

active teachers here. I feel sorry for them. They earn just as much as one who is not as good. . . .

"Almost socialistic" is how the above principal summed up his type of school's lack of career ladder and its concomitant rewards.

[10]"School poverty level," according to the OERI (1994) "is the percentage of students in the school who receive free or reduced price lunch" (p. 2). According to the study, the "percentage of eighth grade students reporting mostly A's from grade six to the present" ranged from a high of 33% in math in schools with a "poverty level" of 0 to 10% to a low of 28% in schools with a "poverty level" of 76 to 100%. In English, perhaps because of students of limited English proficiency, the discrepancy was somewhat larger (34% versus 23%), but still surprisingly small.

[11]Since 1990, the nation's governors and two presidents have looked the nation straight in the eye and proclaimed "By the year 2000, American students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement." How many of the nation's 15,000 school boards have taken this goal seriously? What concrete steps have district and school administrators implemented to achieve this goal? How many teachers of mathematics or science are not only aware but seriously committed to this goal? *How many really have an idea what it means to be "first in the world in mathematics and science achievement"*? They have but six years to find out, retrain, retool, and reteach.